

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. 2:24-cv-09553-RGK-SK Date March 10, 2025

Title *Brandon Joe Williams v. United States Small Business Administration*

Present: The Honorable R. GARY KLAUSNER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joseph Remigio

Not Reported

N/A

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter / Recorder

Tape No.

Attorneys Present for Plaintiff:

Attorneys Present for Defendant:

Not Present

Not Present

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) Order Re: Plaintiff's Request for Judgment on the Pleadings Under Rule 58 [DE 37]

This is an action brought by Brandon Joe Williams ("Plaintiff")—a "natural person" who, despite being born in Indiana, identifies as a "foreign national of the Nation of the Amnesty Coalition" and not a citizen of any state or country, and therefore not subject to this Court's or any court's jurisdiction—on behalf of "BRANDON JOE WILLIAMS ®"—a "public corporation" in Plaintiff's name that was purportedly created at the time of Plaintiff's birth "as a buffer or flow-through for all commercial transactions" by Plaintiff. (ECF No. 1-1.)

In May of 2020, the United States Small Business Administration ("Defendant") gave Plaintiff an Economic Injury Disaster Loan. On June 20, 2024, Plaintiff sent Defendant a letter notifying Defendant that the loan was void and "ordering" Defendant to discharge the loan, according to incoherent interpretations of the Uniform Commercial Code. Unsurprisingly, Defendant did not heed Plaintiff's orders. Consequently, on September 20, 2024, Plaintiff filed a Complaint against Defendant in state court, asserting various contract and tort claims seeking rescission of the loan and \$2 million in damages. (Compl., ECF No. 1-1.) On November 5, 2024, Defendant removed the action to this Court pursuant to the federal officer removal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1). (ECF No. 1.)

On December 30, 2024, the Court denied Plaintiff's Motion to Remand and granted Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, finding that Defendant's removal was proper because the action was filed against a United States agency, and that dismissal was warranted for failure to state a claim, noting that the Complaint relied on unintelligible arguments commonly brought by sovereign citizens, which courts have uniformly rejected. (ECF No. 23.) The Court thereby dismissed Plaintiff's claims with prejudice.

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's "Request for Judgment on the Pleadings" under Rule 58. Plaintiff seeks a final judgment so that he may file an appeal. No such order is necessary, however, as the Court has already dismissed Plaintiff's Complaint with prejudice, and that order "is final and

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL

Case No. 2:24-cv-09553-RGK-SK

Date March 10, 2025

Title *Brandon Joe Williams v. United States Small Business Administration*

appealable.” *Holt v. Castaneda*, 832 F.2d 123, 124 (9th Cir. 1987). Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s Motion **as moot**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

JRE/sf
